

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/041,638

Applicant(s)

IISAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Minh Trinh

Art Unit

3729

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Minh Trinh.

(3) _____.

(2) Yong S. Choi.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 February 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-35.

Identification of prior art discussed: of the record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

~~Examiner's signature, if required~~

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner suggested the claim language such as a projecting member 62 in replace of an object as recited in the present invention claims. Such claim subject matter is described in the specification page 43 and shown in Fig. 7 reference 62 would make the claims overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112 second paragraph and the prior art rejections (APA). No agreement was reached because Mr. Yong would requested more time to consult w/ the applicants for an agreement with respect to the claim languages suggested by the Examiner (see attached Office Action).